

**Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)**

**Date: 30 August 2016**

**Subject: King Lane Area Traffic Regulation Order**

**Capital Scheme Number : 32607**

Are specific electoral wards affected? If 'yes', name(s) of ward(s): Alwoodley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity or cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for call-in?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If 'yes', access to information procedure rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**Summary of main issues**

- 1 As a result of planning permission being granted for a Medical Centre on King Lane, Alwoodley, the developer has entered into a Section 106 agreement ( **ref : 15/00554** ) to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order to prevent indiscriminate parking on King Lane in relation to the new development.
2. Concerns have been raised by Ward Members and local residents regarding parking issues on various other locations in the Alwoodley Ward where indiscriminate parking is causing a hazard to other road users.
3. This report seeks authority to advertise and implement amendments to the Alwoodley Ward Traffic Regulation Consolidation Order (No.42) 2014, details of which are shown on the attached Drawing Nos TM-02-2580-01-01a to 01h and outlined in item 4.1.3.

**Best City Ambition**

4. The Best Council Plan 2015-20 outlines how Leeds City will achieve its ambition to become the Best City in the UK and Leeds City Council the best local authority and according to the Best Council Plan, the success of the Best Council objective: ensuring high quality public services will be partly measured through reduced numbers of people Killed or Seriously Injured on the city's roads. By enhancing the local residential environments through removing indiscriminate and obstructive parking, this will result in a safer and more user friendly road environment for all road users.

## **5 Recommendations**

The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:

- i) Authorise the detailed design and subsequent implementation of a scheme in the Alwoodley Ward, as shown on drawings TM-02-2580-01-01a to 01h to introduce a series of waiting restrictions at various locations across Alwoodley;
- ii) Approve the injection of £10,000 into the Capital Programme funded from a Section 106 private developer receipt;
- iii) Give authority to incur expenditure of £7,000 works costs, £1,000 legal fees and £2,000 staff costs fully funded from a Section 106 private developer receipt;
- iv) Instruct the City Solicitor to:
  - a) Advertise amendments to the Alwoodley Ward Traffic Regulation Consolidation Order (No. W42) Order 2014; and
  - b) Should no valid objections be received, make and seal the order as advertised.

### **1. Purpose of this report**

1.1 The purpose of this report is;

- I. to seek approval for the detailed design and implementation of a package of waiting restrictions as shown on the attached Drawing Nos TM-02-2580-01-01a – 01h to remove indiscriminate parking; and
- II. to seek authorisation for the City Solicitor to make, advertise and seal a Traffic Regulation Order to introduce waiting restrictions at various locations in Alwoodley.

### **2. Background information**

2.1 Leeds City Council entered an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to undertake highway works in the area that are implementable by the means of a Traffic Regulation Order with the developer meeting all costs for the scheme.

2.2 The Section 106 Agreement stipulates that the Council will implement a Traffic Regulation Order in the vicinity of the development in the interest of road safety.

2.3 The Authority have received various complaints and queries regarding a variety of parking issues within the Alwoodley area, and those which, following investigation, are considered to require action have been included in this scheme and described in item 4.1.3.

### **3 Main issues**

#### **3.1 Design Proposals/Scheme Description**

3.1.1 Over a period of 12 months, Leeds City Council has collated a list of issues that it deems require remedial action in the form of waiting restrictions.

3.1.2 The issues are centred around areas where the free flow of traffic is restricted due to parked vehicles, accessibility issues caused by parked vehicles and highway safety concerns that would benefit from the introduction of parking restrictions.

3.1.2 The proposals contain 9 areas of concern and they are as follows:

- I. King Lane (south of its junction with Lingfield Approach to its junction with the bus turning area) – Introduction of double yellow lines to remove indiscriminate and obstructive parking relating to the medical centre;
- II. Saxon Mount – Introduction of double yellow lines on the north side to prevent double parking relating to the medical centre
- III. King Lane (between The Avenue and Alwoodley Lane) – Introduction of double yellow lines to remove obstructive parking along a very narrow section;
- IV. King Drive / Sunningdale Avenue – Introduction of double yellow lines to remove parking around a bend to improve sight lines;
- V. Primley Park Avenue / Primley Park Road – Introduction of double yellow lines around the junction to remove indiscriminate parking at this busy junction;
- VI. Sandringham Approach – Introduction of double yellow lines to remove obstructive parking near the junction that often causes traffic to stack up onto Shadwell Lane when met with on coming vehicles;
- VII. High Ash Drive – Introduction of double yellow lines to remove obstructive parking next to the access road for the rear of the shops.
- VIII. Sandmoor Avenue – Introduction of double yellow lines to remove obstructive parking near the junction causing traffic to have difficulties exiting A61 Harrogate Road.
- IX. Sandmoor Drive – Introduction of double yellow lines to remove obstructive parking near the junction causing traffic to have difficulties exiting A61 Harrogate Road.

3.1.4 The total estimated cost of the required highway works is £7,000 works costs, £2,000 staff fee costs and £1,000 legal fee costs all to be funded by a Section 106 contribution from the developer.

#### **4.0 Programme**

4.1 It is anticipated that the proposal will be commenced within the 2016/ 2017 financial year.

## **4 Corporate considerations**

### **4.1 Consultation and engagement**

4.1.1 Ward Members: Alwoodley Councillors were consulted by e-mail on 8 June 2016. One responded asking for the addition of Saxon Mount, one responded asking to make sure some of the junctions off King Lane were protected, and the final ward member showed support providing the other concerns were taken into account. A further consultation was undertaken on 29 June 2016 with the introduction of further restrictions as requested, and the changes were discussed at a meeting on 25 June 2016 and all three Ward Members approved the scheme.

4.1.2 Emergency Services were consulted via email on 8 June 2016. The fire service responded with no adverse comments and no other adverse comments were received from the blue light services.

4.1.3 West Yorkshire Combined Authority were consulted via email on 8 June 2016 and responded in support of the scheme.

4.1.4 The scheme was discussed with the Safety Officers and it was deemed that a full audit was not required.

4.1.5 Alwoodley Parish Council was consulted by email on 9 June 2016. No comments were received.

### **4.2 Equality and diversity, cohesion and integration**

4.2.2 A screening document has been prepared and an independent impact assessment is not required for the approvals requested.

#### Positive Impacts

- i) Removing indiscriminate parking improves the sight lines for drivers and removes indiscriminate and obstructive parking;
- ii) Clearer sightlines at junction crossing points for all pedestrians which will be of greater benefit to the infirm, disabled, elderly and children as it will provide improved visibility.
- iii) Providing a safer environment for members of the public when crossing in the locality, especially in areas near schools will benefit all pedestrians, especially those with mobility issues, disabled people, parents supporting pushchairs and young and old people;

#### Negative Impacts:

- i) Removal of parked vehicles may lead to increases in vehicle speeds as they are a natural traffic calming feature;



## **5 Legal implications, access to information and call-in**

- 5.1 There are no specific Legal implications included within this report, nor is any information contained within the report to be deemed confidential.
- 5.2 The scheme is in the annual programme and will be completed in the 2016-2017 financial year.

## **6.0 Risk management**

- 6.1 There is no risk, over and above those expected when working in the public highway, generated by the proposals contained within this report.

## **7.0 Conclusions**

- 7.1 It is considered appropriate to introduce amendments to the Alwoodley Ward Traffic Regulation Consolidation Order (No.W42) 2014. These amendments will provide visibility benefits and remove indiscriminate parking in various locations in Alwoodley.

## **8.0 Recommendations**

- 8.1 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
- i) Authorise the detailed design and subsequent implementation of a scheme in the Alwoodley Ward, as shown on drawings TM-02-2580-01-01a to 01h to introduce a series of waiting restrictions on various locations across Alwoodley;
  - ii) Approve the injection of £10,000 into the Capital Programme funded from a Section 106 private developer receipt;
  - iii) Give authority to incur expenditure of £7,000 works, £1,000 legal fees and £2,000 staff costs fully funded from a Section 106 private developer receipt;
  - iv) Instruct the City Solicitor to:
    - a) Advertise amendments to the Alwoodley Ward Traffic Regulation Consolidation Order (No. W42) Order 2014; and
    - b) Should no valid objections be received, make and seal the order as advertised.

## **9.0 Background documents<sup>1</sup>**

- 9.1 None.

---

<sup>1</sup> The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

# Appendix 1

## Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening



As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions. Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being/has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

<b>Directorate:</b> City Services	<b>Service area:</b> Traffic Management
<b>Lead person:</b> James Chadwick	<b>Contact number:</b> 3952784

**1. Title:** King Lane Traffic Regulation Order

Is this a:

**Strategy / Policy**
                         
  **Service / Function**
                         
  **Other**

**If other, please specify:** Highway Improvement Scheme to address accident pattern and accommodate increased traffic volume associated with new development.

**2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening**

The Screening focuses on the proposals to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order at various locations across the Alwoodley Ward. The restrictions will protect problematic locations from indiscriminate parking whilst removing / reducing vehicular conflicts and aid pedestrian movement.

**3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration**

All the council's strategies/policies, services/functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater/lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation and any other relevant

characteristics (for example socio-economic status, social class, income, unemployment, residential location or family background and education or skills levels).		
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?	X	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?		X
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		X
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		X
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment</li> <li>• Advancing equality of opportunity</li> <li>• Fostering good relations</li> </ul>		X

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

<b>4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration</b>
If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.
Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?</b> (think about the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)</li> </ul> <p>The Emergency Services, West Yorkshire Combined Authority and Ward Members have been consulted. All have responded positively with the exception of the Ambulance service who did not reply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key findings (think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)</b></li> </ul> <p>Positive Impacts</p> <p>i) Removing indiscriminate parking improves the sight lines for drivers and</p>



removes indiscriminate and obstructive parking;

- ii) Clearer sightlines at junction crossing points for all pedestrians which will be of greater benefit to the infirm, disabled, elderly and children as it will provide improved visibility.
- iii) Providing a safer environment for members of the public when crossing in the locality, especially in areas near schools will benefit all pedestrians, especially those with mobility issues, disabled people, parents supporting pushchairs and young and old people;

Negative Impacts:

- iv) Removal of parked vehicles may lead to increases in vehicle speeds as they are a natural traffic calming feature;
- v) Parking could be displaced into surrounding areas; and
- vi) Some may see it as a negative to remove parking through the introduction of double yellow lines. However this is not an issue for blue badge holders.

- **Actions (think about how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)**

N/A

**5. If you are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you will need to carry out an impact assessment.**

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	n/a
Date to complete your impact assessment	n/a
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	n/a

#### **6. Governance, ownership and approval**

Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

<b>Name</b>	<b>Job title</b>	<b>Date</b>
Nicholas Hunt	Traffic Engineering Manager	June 2016

#### **7. Publishing**

This screening document will act as evidence that due regard to equality and diversity has been given. If you are not carrying out an independent impact assessment the screening document will need to be published.

Please send a copy to the Equality Team for publishing

<b>Date screening completed</b>	17 June 2016
---------------------------------	--------------

<b>Date sent to Equality Team</b>	
<b>Date published</b> (To be completed by the Equality Team)	